

am pleased to report . . . that the ABA Committee reported to the Attorney General of the United States and subsequently to the Senate Judiciary Committee it's unanimous opinion that Bill Osteen is well-qualified for this appointment. This is the highest rating the Committee gives."

Bill Osteen, Jr., justifiably proud of his father and law partner, but being completely honest and candid, stated: "There was only comfort through my father's presence, his love and his support. And he's been there for each member of this family every time it was needed . . . But his magnificence as a father is probably only equaled by his great ability and competence as a lawyer . . . Each time he has taken a client—and I've practiced with him for four years now, but I'm confident that this was true for his entire 30 years. Each time he's taken a client, he has brought to the representation honor, integrity, diligence and confidence that are not to be found very often. There have been a lot of big cases, a lot of outstanding cases, and there have been a lot of small cases. But regardless of whether a case was big or small, or whether it was important to society or whether it was important only to an individual, he has brought the same honor and integrity to each case; and I'm proud to have practiced with him for the time that we have."

The Honorable Eugene Gordon commented: "Bill . . . brings to this court a vast experience gained from years of private practice and an illustrious career in this district as United States Attorney . . . Also, his legislative service and his community service can't be overlooked. Those services are very valuable for one who is called on to assume responsibilities as a member of the judiciary is . . . The efficiency and goals of the offices which he has served were never in jeopardy; it was always done well. He has reflected well upon himself, and he has served this area with distinction . . . Bill is a good person, with a passion for decency. He possesses no hatred, no jealousy, no envy or ill will that I have ever discerned. The truth is simply this. He is just a hard person to dislike." "It is our good fortune that one of Bill Osteen's vision, ability and character has come forward for active service on the bench . . ."

The Honorable Richard Erwin stated: "Judge Osteen comes to the federal bench as well prepared for the tasks awaiting him as any judge I know. He has served as United States Attorney for this district; in private practice he has represented defendants charged with criminal offenses; and also represented both plaintiffs and defendants in civil actions before the federal courts . . . Judge Osteen also possesses an even-handed disposition that we call judicial temperament."

The Honorable Frank Bullock commented: "I don't believe that President Bush has made a better judicial appointment during his term in office . . . Bill Osteen should be a judge of this court. He has dedicated his life to service, to his family, to his church, to his state and to his nation. He has served in the legislature and as United States Attorney and as an officer of the state bar. I am confident that there is no better trial lawyer in this district and in this state and probably in this circuit or in this nation."

The Honorable Woody Tilley said this: "But not only is Bill Osteen the best trial lawyer I've ever seen . . . he also is one of the best people that I have ever known."

These were not empty accolades or over statements. If they missed the mark in any respect, it is because they understate the exemplary qualities with which Bill Osteen has been endowed and the principles which he has invariably followed.

The oath taken by Judge Osteen at his commissioning in part is this: "I, William Lindsay Osteen, Sr., do solemnly swear that I will administer justice without respect to persons and do equal justice to the poor and to the rich; and that I will faithfully and impartially discharge and perform all duties incumbent upon me as United States District Judge under the Constitution and laws of the United States . . ."

Bill Osteen has been as faithful to this oath as he has been to the promise he made to his mother years earlier.

Judge Osteen, the Greensboro Bar Association takes pride and pleasure in presenting to you the highest honor it can bestow, its Distinguished Service Award. This award is in recognition of and is in deep appreciation for your having demonstrated in many ways your deep devotion and constant commitment to the honorable practice of law and to the better administration of justice; for your having made enduring contributions to the administration of justice and to the public good through unselfish service to the community and to the legal profession; for your adherence at all times to the highest ethical standards of professionalism; and for your thereby setting by example a standard of conduct and service to which the members of the Greensboro Bar Association might well aspire.

RECOGNITION OF THE 2004 OUTSTANDING FARM FAMILY

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, July 20, 2004

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to rise today to extend congratulations to the Wendell Thomas Family for being selected the 2004 Outstanding Farm Family. The Thomas family has run an extremely successful farm in Northwest Florida for nearly 60 years.

Wendell's parents started the Thomas farm in 1945, and to this day his mother, Lizzie Kate, is still an active partner in the family business. Wendell began working at an early age, and after graduating high school in 1970 he became a full time employee in the family's operation. A year after that, he married Dwynette Lewis, and together they raised three daughters who have all contributed to the farm.

In 1981, Wendell purchased an aircraft and shortly afterward received his certification to apply protective chemicals and fertilizers to the family's crops. In 1982, Wendell began running the farm full-time due to the decline in his father's health. Over these nearly 60 years, the Thomas family farm has expanded from one hundred to one thousand acres of cotton, peanuts, pasture, and woodland.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I would like to offer my sincere commendation to a family that could serve as a role model to us all. A deep sense of work ethic and values has been instilled through all the generations of the Wendell Thomas Family. It is my hope that this family tradition continues for many generations to come.

NORTHERN UGANDA CRISIS RESPONSE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 2004

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss current legislation S. 2246. I support this bill which would order the Secretary of State to issue a report on the situation in northern and eastern Uganda. This bill, if passed, would also place much needed pressure on the Ugandan Government to provide increased protection to innocent civilians, pressure the Lord's Resistance Army, under the leadership of Joseph Kony, to lay down its arms, and force the Government of Sudan to come clean about its relationship with the LRA.

The people of Uganda have had enough. The fighting between the northern rebel group known as the Lord's Resistance Army and the Government of Uganda has gone on for more than 18 years. Their mission to overthrow the government is costing many people their lives and their livelihoods. As a result of the civil conflict, more than 1.4 million people are displaced within Uganda. Furthermore, women and young girls are being brutally raped and humiliated, young boys are being abducted and forced to serve in the ranks of the rebel insurgency. Bodies have been maimed and many have died mercilessly.

The most shameful piece of this story is that there are suspicions that the Government of Sudan, to the immediate north of Uganda, has and continues to aid LRA rebel forces with supplies and safety from Government of Uganda military forces. Such accusations, if true, demand the attention of the United States and the international community especially given the current crisis in Darfur.

Before we can properly offer assistance to the Government of Uganda and the people of Uganda, we must have concrete information that accurately details the extent of the human devastation in Uganda. This bill, if passed, would place that information in our hands. Without a thorough knowledge of the situation in Uganda, we will be unable to provide humanitarian relief and assistance to millions of men, women, and children suffering under the hands of oppressive rebel tyrants.

A report by the Secretary of State would be highly beneficial to human rights monitors, international humanitarian agencies, and lawmakers in the United States and around the world. It would explain the state of communications and infrastructure. It would explain the degree to which the rebels have permeated northern and eastern Uganda. It would explain the state of security and the degree to which civilians and outsiders are protected from vigilant rebels. Such information is crucial if we are to help lift the people of Uganda out of their current crisis and bring down the Lord's Resistance Army.

Bringing an end to this campaign will keep Uganda on its current track toward stability, especially regarding the AIDS crisis. This nation has seen more than 800,000 of its people die from HIV/AIDS and has seen more than 1.5 million of its children orphaned by this deadly virus. On the bright side, though, this country has worked vigorously to curb those

numbers by implementing pro-active anti-HIV campaigns. As a result, its infection rate has been reduced from 30 percent in 1990 to 5 percent in 2003.

This is a country that is making real strides toward peace. If we remain passive while the Lord's Resistance Army marches on, we can be sure that the public health, education, technology, and agriculture infrastructures will deteriorate.

Mr. Speaker, we must take this all-important step to learn as much as we can about what is happening in Uganda if we are to respond appropriately in the future. For the reasons stated above, I support S. 2264.

THE TURKISH INVASION OF CYPRUS, AND DEMILITARIZATION OF THE ISLAND

HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 2004

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, July 20, 2004, marked the 30-year anniversary of Turkey's invasion and occupation of Cyprus. Since 1974, United States policy on the Cyprus problem has been unsuccessful in its efforts to influence an agreeable resolution to this division. On May 1, 2004, Cyprus became a member of the European Union of families as a divided and occupied nation, its northern part being under illegal Turkish military occupation. The potential reunification of Cyprus is at a critical juncture. The Greek Cypriot "no" vote of 76 percent and the Turkish Cypriot "yes" vote of 65 percent is strong evidence of the unfair and unbalanced nature of the current version of the Annan Plan. If the yes and no votes had been close to the 50–50 mark, it might be argued that the plan is fair and balanced. At this point, however, no reasonable person can make such an argument. Accordingly, the United States and the United Nations must re-examine the key provisions of the Annan Plan in an effort to remedy the deficiencies that now plague the plan and obstruct the potential reunification of Cyprus.

One deficiency of the Annan Plan is its failure to demilitarize Cyprus. There is no need for Turkish or Greek soldiers to remain in Cyprus. The United States should insist on full demilitarization now. The final Annan Plan actually provides for the permanent presence of 650 Turkish troops on Cyprus with the right of "intervention" by Turkey, a guarantor power under the 1959–1960 London Zurich agreements. With Cyprus now a full member of the EU, there is no need for Britain, Turkey or Greece to remain as guarantor powers.

Quite inexplicably, the Annan Plan does not provide for the immediate demilitarization of Cyprus. It provides for the gradual withdrawal of Turkey's 35,000/40,000 troops over 14 years with 650 remaining permanently. Earlier versions of the Plan did not authorize any Turkish troops to remain.

There is no security problem for the Turkish Cypriots. The opening of the Green Line for crossings in Nicosia since April 2003 has allowed Greek and Turkish Cypriots to interact on a regular basis, and this period has passed without major incident.

As long ago as July 25, 1978, former Republican Senator Bob Dole proposed demili-

tarization on the Senate floor during the Senate debate on the amendment, which passed, to remove the remaining arms embargo on Turkey. Dole voted against lifting the embargo and noted that "[n]egotiations between the two communities have remained stalemated over the presence of the Turkish occupation force." He stated:

The great need for demilitarization of Cyprus, involving withdrawal of both Greek and Turkish forces, must be stressed. . . . Once demilitarization of Cyprus is achieved, then the intercommunal talks between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities over the territorial and political settlement will proceed much more smoothly. This must be the goal of all parties: to achieve demilitarization of Cyprus as soon as possible.

It is beyond dispute that this aspect of the Annan Plan would actually serve to decrease stability and security on the island because it fails to fully demilitarize Cyprus at the same time that it also affirms intervention rights for Turkey. These provisions of the Annan Plan must be changed if the plan is to be accepted by both parties, and carried out to successfully achieve a peaceful, unified Cyprus.

RECOGNIZING THE SCHOOL FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES AT ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE

HON. BERNARD SANDERS

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 2004

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, every day the media bombards us with stories about how dangerous the world is. War and terrorism are, tragically, a part of our modern condition. Yet this picture of international antagonism is so incomplete as to give us a false picture of the globe we inhabit. Fortunately, there are continual efforts, heroic efforts, to bring people together.

In fact, though often unrecognized by the mass media, international cooperation and efforts at mutual understanding take place every day. It is important that we recognize those who do the essential and heroic work of building the bridges that unite the international community.

Today I want to recognize the fine work of the School for International Studies at St. Michael's College, a private liberal-arts college in Colchester, VT, as the school celebrates its 50th anniversary. During the past five decades, over 15,000 international students have studied English at the St. Michael's campus in Colchester.

Founded in 1954 with a small program that taught four students from Puerto Rico, Quebec and Colombia, the program quickly grew to include students from 20 countries.

In 1957 the program welcomed 100 Hungarian refugees, known as Freedom Fighters for their 1956 uprising against Soviet troops, to the campus to learn English. The program was so successful that in 1962 a master's degree in Teaching English as a Second Language (MATESL) was established. Today, the School for International Studies has a worldwide reputation as a leader in language teaching pedagogy.

By the 1970s the program was teaching language students from over 40 countries around the world.

Nor has the growth and scope of the program slackened in current years. Recently the program has welcomed its first students from Vietnam and Egypt, and has developed partnerships with institutions in Poland, Thailand, Greece, and Colombia. Students from more than 65 countries have studied in the Saint Michael's School of International Studies.

This week Saint Michael's College President Marc vanderHeyden presided over a celebration of this 50th anniversary, joined by speakers from some of Saint Michael's partner schools, Kanazawa Technical College of Japan, the Hellenic-American Union of Athens, both the International Christian University and Surugadai University of Tokyo, and the Gimnasio Vermont of Bogota.

To St. Michael's College, and to its School for International Studies in particular, a proud state and proud Nation say: Congratulations on working for half a century to bring people together and to build better communication between nations. We wish you well for the next half-century as you continue this vital work.

INTRODUCTION OF THE QUALITY, EFFICIENCY, SAFETY, AND TECHNOLOGY FOR HEALTHCARE TRANSFORMATION ACT

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 21, 2004

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for Josie King. Josie was a vibrant eighteen-month-old who suffered a terrible accident and, thanks to the incredible advances in medicine, was saved and preparing to go home from the hospital.

Before she could, though, the same health system that saved her then took her life. That sweet little girl was lost to a series of entirely preventable mistakes in one of the finest hospitals in the nation, if not the world.

Politicians like to say that the United States has the best healthcare system in the world. But we don't. What we have is the best medical talent in the world, the best medical technology in the world, the best facilities in the world.

But the system itself is a mess.

The best healthcare system in the world would not allow nearly 100,000 people like Josie King to die in hospitals of preventable medical errors.

The best system in the world would not leave the United States ranked 28th in the world for infant mortality, in the company of Cuba, Hungary, and Slovakia.

The best system would not leave almost 75 million people—nearly one in three people under 65—without health insurance at some point over a 2 year period, especially when the National Academy of Sciences has documented that people without insurance have worse health and die sooner.

The best system wouldn't waste 30 cents on the dollar, or 1,400 dollars per employee per year, on care that does nothing to improve clinical outcomes. That's a 2 billion dollar tax on employers and taxpayers in my home state of Rhode Island in 2004, and an estimated 77.44 trillion dollars for the nation over the next decade.

And, one thing I know for certain, Mr. Speaker, the best healthcare system would